

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ANYWHERE COMMERCE, INC. and )  
BBPOS LIMITED, )  
Plaintiffs, )  
v. ) CIVIL ACTION NO.:  
INGENICO INC., INGENICO CORP. ) 1:19-cv-11457-IT  
and INGENICO GROUPS, SA, )  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
)

The 30 (b) (6) VIDEO DEPOSITION of MICHAEL KRON,  
taken in the above-entitled cause, before Susan Steudel,  
official reporter, on the 2nd day of November, 2021

Page 2

Page 3

## 1 APPEARANCES:

2  
3 ADLER POLLOCK & SHEEHAN, P.C.  
4 Once Citizens Plaza, 8th Floor  
5 Providence, RI 02903-1345  
6 Ph: 401-274-1345  
7 Jtechentin@apslaw.com  
8 BY: Jeffrey K. Techentin,  
9 On behalf of the Defendants;

10  
11 Kutak Rock  
12 1760 Market Street, Suite 1100  
13 Philadelphia, PA 19104-4104  
14 Ph: 215-353-8484  
15 Melissa.bozeman@kutakrock.com  
16 BY: Melissa Bozeman,  
17 On behalf of the Plaintiffs;

## 20 ALSO PRESENT:

21 David Oxilia, Videographer

25

Page 4

Page 5

1 Exhibit 36 Minutes of a board of directors  
2 meeting dated September 15th,  
3 2014 134

## 4 PREVIOUSLY MARKED EXHIBITS REFERENCED:

5 NUMBER	6 PAGE / LINE
6 Exhibit 1	7 66 / 24
7 Exhibit 1	8 116 / 1
8 Exhibit	9 134 / 1

## 9 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED:

10 Page / Line
11 86 / 23
12 87 / 8
13 87 / 16
14 88 / 2
15 88 / 10
16 89 / 17
17 90 / 25
18 91 / 13
19 91 / 23
20 106 / 25

21  
22  
23  
24  
25

INDEX OF EXAMINATIONS:		
EXAMINATION	PAGE	
BY MR. TECHENTIN	6	
Reporter certification	155	
EXHIBITS:		
NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Exhibit 26	Notice of deposition for December 2, 2021	8
Exhibit 27	Six-page document entitled "AnywhereCommerce, Inc.'s Response to Rule 30(B)(6) Deposition Notice."	9
Exhibit 28	Email	17
Exhibit 29	Document entitled "License Agreement and Non-competition Agreement."	19
Exhibit 30	Second amended counterclaims	25
Exhibit 31	AnywhereCommerce, Inc.'s and BBPOS Limited's answer to Ingenico Inc.'s second amended counterclaims	28
Exhibit 32	Engineering development and license agreement dated May 4th, 2010	30
Exhibit 33	Email Subject: What's going on in BBPOS side.	125
Exhibit 34	Email Subject: One last	129

1 MONTREAL, CANADA  
2 December 2, 2021  
3 \*\*\*\*\*  
4 (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 12:30 P.M.)  
5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good afternoon. We're now on  
6 the record.  
7 This begins videotape number 1 in the 30(b)(6)  
8 deposition of Michael Kron in the matter of  
9 AnywhereCommerce, Inc. and BBPOS Limited versus Ingenico  
10 Inc., et al., in the United States District Court For the  
11 District of Massachusetts, civil docket number  
12 1:19-cv-11457-IT. Today's date is December 2, 2021, and  
13 the time on the video monitor is 2:34 P.M.  
14 This deposition is being taken remotely via Zoom  
15 in Montreal, Quebec, Canada, at the request of counsel for  
16 Ingenico Inc. et al, Adler Polluck & Sheehan, P.C.  
17 Videographer is David Oxilia of Magna Legal Services and  
18 the court reporter is Susan Steudel, also with Magna.  
19 Will counsel and all parties present state their  
20 appearances and whom they represent.  
21 MR. TECHENTIN: Jeffrey Techentin on behalf of  
22 the defendants.  
23 MS. BOZEMAN: Melissa Bozeman of Kutak Rock on  
24 behalf of the plaintiffs.  
25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. The court reporter

<p>1 confirm that?</p> <p>2 Q. I'm asking you, unfortunately. So we'll get your 3 best recollection.</p> <p>4 A. I'll say yes. It includes POGO.</p> <p>5 Q. Is POGO a private, white labelled product?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Is it a white labelled version of Rambler?</p> <p>8 A. I believe so. My best recollection.</p> <p>9 Q. I'll ask this question and you're not going to 10 know the answer so my follow-up question is going to be 11 how we figure it out; okay? So just so you know. I'm not 12 trying to trick you. From May of 2010 forward, how much 13 revenue did AnywhereCommerce generate by selling products 14 that were either mag stripe with audio jack capability or 15 EMV capable and Bluetooth enabled?</p> <p>16 A. You want an answer to the nearest million, 17 or ...?</p> <p>18 Q. I told you you weren't going to know the answer. 19 Do you happen to know that? It would be a pretty 20 remarkable thing if you did.</p> <p>21 A. No. I don't have that exact number, no.</p> <p>22 Q. So my follow-up question is how would we figure 23 out? If we wanted to go through AnywhereCommerce's books 24 and records to try and figure out how many of these units 25 were sold and how much they sold for, how would we go</p>	<p>1 about doing that?</p> <p>2 A. We would just ask my controller to go through the 3 accounting records and then she could produce that report.</p> <p>4 Q. Well, unfortunately she's not here and she 5 doesn't -- she's not on Ingenico's payroll. So do you 6 know if materials have been produced in this litigation to 7 the defendants that would allow them to figure that out?</p> <p>8 A. I do not know.</p> <p>9 Q. Have you been involved with the gathering of 10 documents for production in this case?</p> <p>11 A. What do you mean by "involved"? I handed over my 12 computer and I handed over access to my computer and 13 everything was downloaded. Helped negotiate a contract. 14 I'm not involved beyond that. I did not look at any of 15 the documents that came out of the AnywhereCommerce 16 discovery process.</p> <p>17 Q. What are you talking about, negotiating a 18 contract?</p> <p>19 A. Well, I guess there's a company that had to take 20 all this information and maintain it and so we paid them 21 some fees.</p> <p>22 Q. Understood. Okay.</p> <p>23 A. That's my involvement.</p> <p>24 Q. Have you had any role in terms of quarterbacking 25 the document gathering process for the company as a whole?</p>
<p>Page 44</p> <p>1 A. My involvement was advising my counsel who have 2 -- who might have had relevant information that they 3 should be including in the discovery process. So the 4 names of employees. The names and introductions to 5 employees and that sort of thing.</p> <p>6 Q. And I don't want to get involved in your 7 conversations with your lawyers about this, but did you 8 personally go out and solicit materials from anybody 9 including your controller, for example?</p> <p>10 A. No. I did not personally solicit information. I 11 made introductions to the parties that did the soliciting.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you take any -- did you -- let me start over. 13 Did you undertake any review of the materials that your 14 attorneys had gathered?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. Have you done any review of the documents that 17 were actually produced in this case?</p> <p>18 A. Did I review any documents that were produced in 19 this case?</p> <p>20 Q. By AnywhereCommerce, I should say.</p> <p>21 A. No, I don't recall reviewing documents that were 22 produced. Nothing comes to mind.</p> <p>23 Q. So you're not familiar with the particulars of 24 the financial disclosures that have been made to us in 25 this case?</p>	<p>Page 45</p> <p>1 A. I seem to recall a list. I seem to recall a list 2 of required documents, and I put parties together, and I 3 assume that all documents that were requested that I saw 4 on a list were provided but I didn't actually review each 5 response. But I did -- I do recall your requesting 6 financial information, et cetera, et cetera, so I presume 7 it was delivered. But I didn't actually verify everything 8 that was delivered.</p> <p>9 Q. Did AnywhereCommerce ever seek any legal advice 10 with respect to the implications of the BBPOS-ROAM license 11 agreement on its ability to continue to sell products like 12 the Rambler?</p> <p>13 MS. BOZEMAN: I'll just caution the client to 14 answer yes or no, but not to disclose the contents to the 15 extent that there was legal advice sought and provided.</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 BY MR. TECHENTIN:</p> <p>18 Q. Does AnywhereCommerce have any contract or other 19 agreement with BBPOS with respect to its own potential 20 liability for the sale of products that are subject to the 21 exclusive licenses in the BBPOS-ROAM Data agreement?</p> <p>22 MS. BOZEMAN: Objection. And can I have that 23 read back. I'm sorry.</p> <p>24 A. Yeah. Same here. (REPORTER READS BACK)</p>

Page 78

1 being offered by Ingenico at a trade show that looked very  
 2 much like our products and they could not have put these  
 3 -- these products came out of nowhere and he didn't  
 4 believe these products could have just been developed in  
 5 this short period of time as when he -- I guess he saw  
 6 their last set of products. I don't know on what basis he  
 7 said that it was a short period of time. I don't know  
 8 what reference point he was using, but that's just what he  
 9 said. I don't know.

10 Q. And I realize this was a long time ago, but I'll  
 11 ask this anyway. But you keep saying products, plural.  
 12 Was he referring to plural products or a single product?  
 13 Do you remember one way or the other?

14 A. Good question. No, I don't remember if it was  
 15 plural products. Because it could be like the Walker, you  
 16 know, that has multiple products called Walker, just  
 17 different features. So he didn't specify whether they  
 18 had, you know, four versions of the same factor that did  
 19 different things. So there was no specification.

20 Q. Did he say which BBPOS products -- product or  
 21 products, these Ingenico products resembled?

22 A. Yes. The Chipper. The Chipper at a high level.  
 23 He didn't specify which Chipper. So I took it as any  
 24 Chipper and variation of Chipper.

25 Q. I apologize for making you say this again, but

Page 79

1 remind me what Chipper is functionally?

2 A. Chipper's like Walker. So it's an EMV reader  
 3 that may or may not have mag stripe and it may or may not  
 4 have Bluetooth and it may not have tap, but it comes in  
 5 different versions. With tap. Without tap. But I'm not  
 6 sure which Chipper version he was referring to.

7 Q. Does it have an audio jack?

8 A. At one point it did and at one point it didn't.

9 I -- I'm not sure. At one point it did maybe and it  
 10 didn't. So this might have -- you know. Probably a  
 11 non-audio jack reader and a chip card reader. Sometimes  
 12 you can put an audio jack slider just on the side. Not  
 13 sure if Chipper had that. But I think it didn't. I would  
 14 think it would be chip only.

15 Q. Is that why it's called Chipper?

16 A. Yeah.

17 Q. Do you know?

18 A. Yeah, because of the chip card feature. Because  
 19 it can accept chip cards, yeah. And Swiper, because it's  
 20 only a swipe card.

21 But, again, I didn't name them, so ...

22 Q. So when was the next time Mr. Lo made any  
 23 representations to you about their being trade secret  
 24 information incorporated into the Ingenico technology?

25 A. At some point later. At some point he

Page 80

1 communicated to me that there was a lawsuit between Will  
 2 Graylin and Ingenico in which Will Graylin mentions that  
 3 he believed that Ingenico is taking trade secrets from  
 4 BBPOS. That was part of a lawsuit. So I think that was  
 5 the next time, and I don't remember when that was when the  
 6 lawsuit took place, when -- that would have been the next  
 7 reference to trade secret theft, was a reference to a  
 8 lawsuit.

9 Q. And did he provide you with any greater detail in  
 10 terms of what the nature of the theft was or the trade  
 11 secrets that were being violated?

12 A. No. It didn't change. It was the same, you  
 13 know, schematics. I understood schematics. But it wasn't  
 14 limited to schematics. It was just a high level  
 15 discussion.

16 Q. Did you review any of the documents from the  
 17 Graylin litigation?

18 A. I seem to recall perusing the Graylin litigation  
 19 at some point out of curiosity.

20 Q. What was the next time that Mr. Lo made any  
 21 representations about the trade secrets?

22 A. Right around the time he decided to engage  
 23 counsel to file a lawsuit.

24 Q. Right around the time Ben Lo hired lawyers to  
 25 file a lawsuit?

Page 81

1 A. Yes. In that time period it would have come --

2 Q. When was that?

3 A. Would have been 2017, I'm presuming. I forgot  
 4 the exact day of the lawsuit, but I'm sure it took six to  
 5 nine months to write it up, so I'm just going by memory.  
 6 I presume it was 2017.

7 Q. So tell me about that conversation, the one that  
 8 you just referenced.

9 MS. BOZEMAN: And I will caution you if this was  
 10 a conversation that was had between you and Ben but it  
 11 reflected any sort of legal analysis or legal advice that  
 12 you had received, then I would be instructing you not to  
 13 answer.

14 A. Yes, it did. It had to do with conversations  
 15 that he had with his counsel.

16 BY MR. TECHENTIN:

17 Q. So let's break that down just a little bit. Was  
 18 this a telephone call?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. When did it occur?

21 A. In the 2017 time period. I can't give you an  
 22 exact day.

23 Q. Who participated in that phone call?

24 A. Just me and him.

25 Q. Where were you?

<p>1 A. I would have been in Montreal most likely.      2 Q. Do you know where he was?      3 A. No.      4 Q. Do you know if he was in the United States?      5 A. I do not. No, I do not. Because he travels      6 around the world so it's like he doesn't always tell. I      7 don't even ask him. That's why I say I don't know because      8 it could have been anywhere.      9 Q. Do you have reason -- oh, sorry.      10 A. He's literally been to 50 countries at least      11 selling products.      12 Q. He lives in Hong Kong; correct?      13 A. He lives in Hong Kong, but he travels probably --      14 used to travel five, six months of the year back then.      15 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that he was in      16 the US?      17 A. He could have been. I don't have any reason to      18 believe that he was or wasn't. He has an office. He has      19 an office in the US so he could have been in the US, but      20 he's got offices in different parts of the world.      21 Q. Who initiated this conversation?      22 A. He did.      23 Q. Did he tell you why he did?      24 A. Why he did what?      25 Q. Initiated the conversation.</p>	<p>1 A. To let me know that he was planning to litigate      2 against Ingenico for trade secret theft. Just inform me.      3 Just to be informative.      4 Q. Let's back that up. Did he send you a text or an      5 email that says hey, let's talk?      6 A. No. He just calls me.      7 Q. What were the topics of your conversations with      8 him?      9 MS. BOZEMAN: I would just caution you not to      10 disclose any information that involves legal advice.      11 A. All of it had to do with his conversation with      12 his counsel.      13 BY MR. TECHENTIN:      14 Q. At the time that this conversation occurred in      15 2017 were you already represented by Kutak Rock?      16 A. Yes. On multiple matters, yes. In other      17 matters, yes.      18 Q. Had you engaged them with respect to potential      19 litigation regarding Ingenico?      20 A. You mean had I signed off on that litigation?      21 Q. No. Were they providing you with advice with      22 respect to potential litigation?      23 A. Yes.      24 Q. And you'd had communications with Kutak Rock on      25 that subject before you had this conversation with Mr. Lo?</p>
<p>1 A. Yes.      2 Q. Do you know if Mr. Lo had ever spoken with anyone      3 from Kutak Rock before that conversation you had with him?      4 A. I believe he'd already -- see he's engaged Kutak      5 Rock for unrelated matters, as have I, but I can't tell      6 you specifically the first time he engaged Kutak Rock on      7 unrelated matters. I'm not sure if this is the first      8 matter with which he discussed with Kutak Rock. He might      9 have had other discussions prior to this discussion which      10 is my answer. On other matters.      11 Q. So excluding counsel's legal advice or mental      12 impressions that might have been shared with you what were      13 the general subject matter topics that you discussed with      14 Mr. Lo in this conversation?      15 A. There was nothing that wasn't part of discussions      16 with counsels. Either my discussions with my counsel or      17 his discussion with his counsel.      18 Q. And let me be clear. I'm trying to make sure      19 that I'm not asking you to tell me what advice your lawyer      20 gave. I'm asking you what topics were discussed and      21 perhaps the discussion included the exchange of that      22 protected type of information, but what was the topic?      23 A. The topic was his intention to litigate against      24 Ingenico. That was the topic. There was no other topic.      25 There was no business topic of a different sort in that</p>	<p>1 conversation.      2 Q. Was one of the topics also your intention to sue?      3 A. Yes. That would have come up as well.      4 Q. Had AnywhereCommerce already taken a decision to      5 sue Ingenico or the defendants prior to this conversation      6 with Mr. Lo?      7 A. Yes.      8 Q. When did that happen?      9 A. It -- at some point in the preceding three-month      10 period.      11 Q. And other than the knowledge that you've      12 described for me about what Mr. Lo told you as far as      13 trade secrets and the RP350X and the RP450X is concerned,      14 leaving that aside, what conduct by the defendants were      15 you aware of three months before this conversation in 2017      16 that justified suing Ingenico?      17 A. Well, the conduct of tortious interference.      18 Q. And we're not going to go over it all again, so      19 I'm going to try and get you to agree with the sort of      20 general statement. So the decision to sue Ingenico was      21 based upon Ingenico's use of BBPOS's trade secret      22 information in its products; right?      23 A. Yes.      24 MS. BOZEMAN: Objection. But you can answer.      25 A. Principally. But that would be the principle;</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 Q. At any time prior to that conversation? 2 A. No. 3 Q. Did Ben Lo say to you, "I've hired Kutak Rock to 4 be my lawyers, too"? 5 A. No. No, he did not. 6 Q. Did Ben Lo say anything that suggested he hadn't 7 hired lawyers yet? 8 A. Yes. He said that he had the intention of hiring 9 Kutak Rock; that they weren't hired yet. 10 Q. And during that phone call -- strike that. 11 Prior to that phone call did you have any agreement 12 with Mr. Lo with respect to the confidentiality of the 13 communications during that phone call? 14 A. No. Not that I know of. I don't know if a 15 general NDA between the two companies just is in 16 existence. I'm not sure if that would -- we didn't have a 17 specific NDA about that phone call, but I believe there's 18 an ongoing NDA as part of our agreement between the two 19 companies. 20 Q. In fact, you didn't have any discussions with Mr. 21 Lo about any parameters for this conversation before the 22 conversation happened; right? 23 A. Right. Nothing specific. No. 24 Q. All right. How long did that phone call take? 25 A. Couldn't have been long. Maybe 15 minutes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 Q. And how many more times did you discuss this 2 litigation with Mr. Lo before this contract was signed? 3 A. Can't recall having further conversations with 4 Mr. Lo privately. I would imagine the next conversation 5 would have included counsel because there were 6 conversations where Oliver Griffin was a party to the 7 conversation. And then there were emails on the paperwork 8 to counsel driving the email communications among the 9 three of us. 10 Q. Okay. At some point did Ben Lo hire Kutak Rock? 11 A. Did Ben Lo hire Kutak Rock? 12 Q. For this lawsuit? 13 MS. BOZEMAN: Individually or? 14 MR. TECHENTIN: I'm sorry. Fair point. Fair 15 point. 16 BY MR. TECHENTIN: 17 Q. Did BBPOS hire Kutak Rock? 18 A. Other than through a three-way agreement, I'm not 19 aware that he hired them separately. 20 Q. And that's sort of my question. Are you aware 21 one way or the other whether BBPOS had engaged Kutak Rock 22 prior to the signing of that letter, of that contract? 23 A. No, I guess not. I guess not. They could have. 24 I guess not. I don't think they did, but ... 25 Q. Okay.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 A. They didn't tell me they did. 2 Q. Other than anything we've talked about up to this 3 point, did AnywhereCommerce do any further investigation 4 into the facts that support its tortious interference 5 claim before it filed suit? 6 A. You mean AnywhereCommerce or its counsel? 7 Q. Or its counsel or private investigators. I don't 8 care who did it. Did you investigate any facts beyond 9 what's already been disclosed here today to support your 10 contentions about tortious interference before filing your 11 complaint? 12 MS. BOZEMAN: I'm going to caution him to not 13 disclose any substance of legal advice or investigations 14 that were done by counsel. But setting that aside you may 15 answer. 16 A. The investigations were with counsel. All 17 investigations included counsel. We did not hire any 18 third parties other Kutak Rock to help make this 19 assessment. 20 BY MR. TECHENTIN: 21 Q. What facts did you learn as a result of any 22 investigations that were performed on your behalf that 23 pertained to the validity of your tortious interference 24 claim? 25 MS. BOZEMAN: I'm going to instruct you not to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 answer to the extent that the factual circumstances relate 2 to the legal or mental impressions of counsel and would 3 include any sort of information received by you for the 4 purposes of obtaining legal advice. So if there's 5 anything separate, you may answer. 6 A. There's nothing separate. 7 MR. TECHENTIN: And, counsel, if you want to have 8 a discussion that's off the record, we can. I take 9 exception to your instruction. Facts aren't privileged 10 and my question was not designed to elicit legal advice or 11 impressions of counsel. But I'm trying to probe the Rule 12 basis for filing this claim, and so I would like to 13 know what facts were available to him that would support 14 the allegation of a tortious interference claim here. If 15 you want to block me from getting those, fine. But I 16 think it's improper because I'm asking about facts. If 17 the facts were communicated to him, I'm entitled to know 18 about them. 19 MS. BOZEMAN: Well, I do disagree with you. 20 Because sometimes facts when they are compiled into a 21 certain order, they can take on significance that reflects 22 the mental impressions of counsel. So to the extent that 23 you're asking for a selection of a universe of information 24 that was at play during the investigation of, you know, 25 relevant facts related to this lawsuit, those, the</p>